

## Barbican Skills and Effectiveness Review Response Log

Question	Results	Comments
<b><i>Role and Vision</i></b>		
Is the role of the Board clear?	Yes = 90% Needs Improvement = 10%  (GREEN)	Insufficient clarity, especially for external Members who may be used to a more typical "trustee" type role. We have been traditionally less hands-on / involved in creative decisions – whether this is by design or convention and may be up for change is another matter.
Do you understand the Barbican's vision, strategic aims and objectives and feel able to contribute to discussions?	Yes = 90% In part = 10%  (GREEN)	
Is there any training or further information or training you feel would be helpful?	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Relatively new to the Board so am still working at getting familiar with the organisation.</p> <p>A dedicated session explaining the vision, strategic aims and objectives would be helpful for new Members.</p> <p>Useful for Members to visit the Centre other than for events – a regular back-of-house visit would be good.</p> <p>Away-days – these meetings held at the Centre are very useful and give us a better feel for all aspects of the Barbican Centre.</p>
Is there clarity regarding what decisions are expected of the Board?	Yes = 73% In part = 9% No = 9% Nil response = 9%  (AMBER)	<p>There is little in the way of training / induction.</p> <p>Board papers are generally for information rather than for decision.</p>
Does the Board have sufficient skills, experience, time and resources to undertake its duties effectively?	Yes = 64% No = 27% Nil response = 9%  (AMBER)	<p>When looking at future external appointments, experience running other arts organisations would be useful.</p> <p>We could benefit from more direct arts experience to give the Board a stronger voice on programming matters. Increased hands-on experience of digital arts delivery, social media and delivery of content would also be a benefit. We also lack strong international cross-border</p>

		<p>expertise.</p> <p>Steps are currently being taken to fill vacancies which will hopefully result in increased diversity and the appointment of someone with significant experience of working in the arts.</p> <p>We may need to think a little harder about our skills mix.</p> <p>More expectation of Corporation Members to attend should be necessary. We should not just be CV filling. Our independent Members are vital and another such could be very useful. Other bodies publish attendances.</p>
Does the Chairman have an effective leadership style?	<p>Yes = 100%</p> <p>(GREEN)</p>	<p>Giles is an excellent Chairman who includes Members in discussion, but still conducts the business expeditiously.</p> <p>Excellent chairing style.</p> <p>He controls the meeting and the agenda. Most courteous to Members and still manages to keep the momentum.</p>
<b><i>The Board's Business</i></b>		
Structure of Agendas	<p>Good = 55%</p> <p>Adequate = 27%</p> <p>Needs improvement = 9%</p> <p>Nil response = 9%</p> <p>(AMBER)</p>	<p>The Part A / Part B structure of City Board agendas is not conducive to structuring meetings effectively, i.e. putting together strategic matters for discussion and decision.</p> <p>Look to the quality of the papers of the 27/09 meeting. All committees could take note.</p>
Content of Committee Papers	<p>Good = 73%</p> <p>Adequate = 9%</p> <p>Needs improvement = 18%</p> <p>(AMBER)</p>	<p>Papers don't always direct us to meaningful strategic discussions – the Board could play a more active role in shaping strategy but the quasi-local government papers sometimes stifle this.</p> <p>The content of reports is good but written reports are often overly long – some guidance would be helpful, noting however that the need to split report content between public and non-public is a further complication.</p> <p>Long and too wordy. We need better executive summaries and more graphical depictions of stats, etc.</p>

		Look to the quality of the papers of the 27/09 meeting. All committees could take note.
Clarity of Minutes	Good = 100%  (GREEN)	I'm impressed by the quality of the minutes.  They are minutes and not blow-by-blow reports. They contain all necessary points and if not Members can correct them.
Timeliness of Agenda and Paper Circulation	Good = 90% Adequate = 10%  (GREEN)	
Scheduling of Meetings	Good = 64% Adequate = 27% Needs improvement = 9%  (AMBER)	Timings are very inconvenient for working Members – earlier or later in the day (perhaps working breakfast or tea) would make a big difference. We should also meet at least every other meeting at the Centre; cost aside there is a lot to be said immersing the Board in the Centre it is there to help govern.  More thought could be given to avoiding conflict with meetings such as the Museum of London, as some Members serve on both.
Clerking Arrangements	Good = 100%  (GREEN)	
<b>Self-Assessment</b>		
Meeting Attendance	Good = 73% Adequate = 18% Nil response = 9%  (AMBER)	
Input at Meetings	Good = 27% Adequate = 64% Nil response = 9%  (RED)	Hope to increase effectiveness as become more familiar with the organisation.  Like some others, I think I fall into the trap of contributing only on my "special" subjects. We could all work harder to pitch in original ideas on matters which are not our areas of expertise – this could add some helpful perspectives.  I make, I hope, appropriate comments as required. I read all papers

		and serve on a sub-committee too.
Interaction with the Centre outside of meetings	<p>Good = 36% Adequate = 55% Needs improvement = 9%</p> <p>(RED)</p>	<p>I aim to do more now the electoral period has passed and I am settling into the Board.</p> <p>I attend as many events as I can – I also walk through the Centre regularly to “experience” what visitors’ perception might be.</p> <p>I think there could/should be greater opportunity to engage with the Centre and understand the challenges it faces, especially issues which don’t come up at Board.</p>
How might your own performance be improved?	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Through more time/experience with the organisation.</p> <p>Through changes to meeting timings; additional training for Board Members; spending more time with the Barbican teams – Board Members can add real value out of the committee meeting itself.</p> <p>It takes time to get to know the management team and issues due to the size, constitution and scope of activities. A more structured induction programme should be considered and implemented – the current induction pack is useful but limited.</p> <p>More focused papers, clearer options for discussion / decision.</p> <p>Happy to attend any training if felt it might be useful.</p>
<b>Information and Communication</b>		
Did you have an induction meeting(s) on joining the Board?	<p>Yes = 55% No = 45%</p> <p>(AMBER)</p>	
Did you receive an induction pack?	<p>Yes = 36% No = 55% Unsure = 9%</p> <p>(RED)</p>	
Usefulness of communications from the Centre relevant to your Board responsibilities?	<p>Good = 45% Adequate = 36% Needs Improvement = 9%</p>	Access to more data online could be useful, but would need to be carefully monitored to ensure content was relevant and appropriate to the Board’s role.

	<p>Nil response = 9%</p> <p>(RED)</p>	<p>Hard to say – we see what might be released publicly in advance, which is good; but I am not sure if we get much sense of the day-to-day inside the Centre or indeed inside the Corporation – obviously a bigger issue for external Members.</p> <p>More regular engagement needed.</p> <p>I look forward to the press coverage.</p>
Other communications from the Centre?	<p>Good = 72%</p> <p>Adequate = 9%</p> <p>Nil response = 9%</p> <p>(GREEN)</p>	<p>It would be helpful for Board Members to automatically receive the weekly update Barbican members receive, perhaps with any extra points for the Board added so it is a co-ordinated and targeted communication.</p>
General comments on effectiveness	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Effective, taking into account the unique structure of the Barbican and its relationship with the City Corporation.</p> <p>Much better than it was when I joined.</p> <p>Very good Board, well managed.</p> <p>Excellent, well-organised, chaired and clerked. Papers are extremely well-written but also very long. I am still finding my feet regarding my input and contribution and will discuss further with Nick and the Chair.</p> <p>It is well formed to undertake its responsibilities, and Board meetings reflect the broad range of skills and experience of Members.</p> <p>I believe we work well; I try to absorb all placed before us and make comments and suggestions / proposals at Board.</p>

Red = No Members scoring their interest / expertise highly, or a lone respondent rating their interest / expertise at a low level

Amber = Multiple Members scoring their interest / expertise at a low level, or a smaller number indicating interest / expertise highly

Green = Multiple Members scoring their interest / expertise highly

Skills Area	Expertise	General Interest
Arts Administration	(R)	(A)
Charity Organisation	(G)	(A)
Commercial	(G)	(A)
Creative Learning	(A)	(A)
Dance	(R)	(G)
Digital	(G)	(G)
Equality Diversity & Inclusion	(G)	(A)
Facilities Management	(R)	(R)
Film	(A)	(A)
Finance	(G)	(A)
Fundraising	(A)	(A)
Governance/Trusteeship	(G)	(A)
Health & Safety	(R)	(R)
Legal	(A)	(A)
Local Authorities	(A)	(A)
Marketing	(R)	(R)
Music	(A)	(A)

Other Business expertise (please state below)		
Personnel Matters	(A)	(A)
Political Knowledge / Contacts (esp. in London)	(G)	(G)
Project Management	(A)	(A)
Property and Urban Realm	(G)	(A)
Public Relations	(A)	(A)
Public Sector Organisations	(G)	(A)
Quality Systems	(R)	(R)
Risk and Audit	(A)	(R)
Theatre	(A)	(G)
Unreached Audiences	(R)	(A)
Visual Arts	(R)	(G)